R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 441 24

STUDENT TEACHER PERSONALITY CHANGE AS A FUNCTION OF THE PERSONALITIES OF SUPERVISING AND COOPERATING TEACHERS.

BY- BILLS, ROBERT E. AND OTHERS
ALABAMA UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY, COLL. OF EDUCATION

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-020 PUB DATE 31 AUG 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.04 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ATTITUDE TESTS, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT, *PERSONALITY CHANGE, PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS, *STUDENT TEACHERS, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA, COLLEGE STUDENT PROBLEMS Q SORT, COLLEGE TEACHER PROBLEMS Q SORT, TEACHERS PROBLEMS Q SORT

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO INVESTIGATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGES IN OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND THE OPENNESS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS. THE STUDENT TEACHERS COMPLETED THE COLLEGE STUDENT PROBLEMS Q-SORT TO MEASURE THEIR OPENNESS AND CHANGES IN OPENNESS DURING STUDENT TEACHING. COOPERATING TEACHERS AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS COMPLETED THE TEACHERS PROBLEMS Q-SORT AND THE COLLEGE TEACHER PROBLEMS Q-SORT TO MEASURE THEIR OPENNESS CHARACTERISTICS. THE STUDY INDICATED THAT NEGATIVE CHANGES IN OPENNESS OCCURED IN THE STUDENT TEACHERS DURING THE STUDENT TEACHING PERIOD. THE SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE CHANGES IN OPENNESS AMONG STUDENT TEACHERS WERE GREATER FOR THOSE WHO WERE MORE OPEN TO EXPERIENCE AT THE BEGINNING OF STUDENT TEACHING. THE NEGATIVE CHANGES IN THE STUDENT TEACHERS WERE RELATED SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE OPENNESS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS BUT NOT TO THE OPENNESS OF THEIR COLLEGE SUPERVISORS. CHANGES IN OPENNESS OF STUDENT TEACHERS WERE SIGNIFICANTLY RELATED TO OPENNESS QUALITIES OF THE COOPERATING TEACHERS BUT NOT TO THE PERCEIVED QUALITIES. HOWEVER, NO SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS IN CHANGE OF OPENNESS OF STUDENT TEACHERS OCCURRED WHEN THESE CHANGES WERE EXAMINED AS FUNCTIONS OF THE ORIGINAL DEGREE OF OPENNESS OF THE STUDENT, HIS COOPERATING TEACHER, OR HIS SUPERVISING TEACHER. (PM)

ED003441

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Student Teacher Personality Change as a Function of the Personalities of Supervising and Cooperating Teachers

Robert E. Bills, Virginia M. Macagnoni, and Richard J. Elliott
College of Education, University of Alabama

Final Report
on
Project S-020
U. S. Office of Education
Cooperative Research Program

August 31, 1964

Student Teacher Personality Change as a Function of the Personalities of Supervising and Cooperating Teachers*

Rogers (1959) postulated a personality continuum extending from closedness to experience to openness. He has also developed a closely related process concept of psychotherapy (1958) in which seven major points may be distinguished between the extremes of stasis (closedness) and process (openness). In successful psychotherapy a person moves from points nearer closedness to experience toward points closer to openness to experience. In studies by Rogers and his colleagues, process has been judged from verbatim transcriptions of interviews, using numerous examples of statements typical of the seven stages of the process scale.

In addition, Rogers (1957) described what appeared to him to be the necessary and sufficient conditions for promoting openness in a client. Barrett-Lennard (1962), among others, has investigated these conditions using a Relationship Inventory which he designed to measure the conditions which Rogers described. Barrett-Lennard's data support the conclusion that successful therapists are seen by their clients to be more congruent, more empathic in their therapy relationships, and more unconditional and positive in their regard for their clients than are less successful therapists. The more congruent, empathic, and unconditional and positive is the regard of the therapist for the client, as seen by the client, the more positive are the outcomes of therapy.

The above work of Rogers and Barrett-Lennard and other work of Rogers (1961) suggested the possibility that the ability of a person to enter a helping relationship may be directly related to his process characteristics and his consequent reflection of congruence, empathy, and positiveness and unconditionality of regard in his helping relationships. As will be seen later in this proposal, inquiries in this area have proved fruitful. There appear to be direct relationships between the openness of a teacher to his experience, both past and present, his judged teaching success, his effect on attitudes toward self and others of pupils, the locus of responsibility for decision making within his classrooms, his ability to change in a learning situation, and the quality of the helping relationships he offers pupils.

Since student teaching is common to most teacher preparation programs and is central to these programs, a fuller understanding of this experience on the openness qualities of students is needed. Such increased understanding should be a preliminary step in the redesigning of and further experimentation with student teaching programs. The study described in this report was an investigation of changes in the openness of student teachers in six institutions of higher learning as functions of the openness and relationship qualities of their cooperating and supervising teachers. For purpose of this study the term

* The authors are appreciative of the work of Snell Mills who served as assistant on the project.

cooperating teacher will refer to the teacher formerly called a critic teacher--the person in the public school classroom who is responsible for the activities of the student teacher. The supervising teacher is the person from the college who works with both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.

Related Literature

Methods of measuring openness usually have involved the analysis of interview material (Rogers, 1958). In therapy interviews, people discuss their problems and from the nature of the discussion, inferences are made about the degree of openness they have to their experience. To objectify a measure of openness and to by-pass the cumbersome and subjective interview method, Bills (1963) collected teaching problems from about 500 teachers in graduate classes. From the numerous one-sentence descriptions given by these teachers, 84 problems were selected as representative of the entire range of their concerns and have been used in a Q-sort to measure openness. Each of the 84 problems has been rated by a panel of three judges working independently of each other, and 39 of the problems are used as a measure of teacher openness. The 84 items of the teacher problems Q-sort, instructions for the Q-sort, and a copy of the record sheet are appended.

Bills has used this Teacher Problems Q-sort in further investigations of the effects of openness and teaching relationships. For example, the 62 members of the staffs of two elementary and one senior high school were asked to sort these problems to describe their most pressing problems. The superintendent and the principals of the schools were then asked to rate the teaching effectiveness of these teachers and these ratings were compared with openness scores obtained from the Q-sort. Obtained chi-squares were associated with probability levels of .01, .001, and .02. Thus, there was reason to conclude that a significant relationship existed between openness as measured by the Q-sort and ratings of success given teachers by their administrative officers.

The effect of openness of teachers on the development of attitudes toward self and others of elementary school children has also been investigated by Bills (1963). Pairs of teachers in grades three through six were selected and measured for openness by means of the above Q-sort. Their pupils were then measured for attitudes toward self and others using the Index of Adjustment and Values (Bills, 1962). The results of this study showed that at less than the .05 level of confidence, pupils taught by teachers with higher openness scores had more positive attitudes toward themselves and other pupils than those taught by teachers with lower openness scores.

Emmerling (1961) investigated the relationships between openness of teachers as shown by the Teacher Problem Q-sort, locus of responsibility for decision making in a classroom, and the quality of the relationships secondary pupils perceive they have with their teachers. Emmerling's study included 20 teachers and 600 randomly selected pupils taught by them. At less than the .001 level of confidence he was able to conclude that the locus of responsibility for decision making in the classes of the teachers with higher openness scores was centered in the teacher and the pupil but in classes of teachers with lower openness scores it was centered either in the teacher or in the pupils but not in

both. Emmerling also concluded that at less than the .001 level of confidence, teachers with higher openness scores are perceived by their pupils as being more empathic, more congruent, and more positive and unconditional in their regard for them whereas teachers with lower openness scores are perceived as being less empathic, less congruent, and less positive and unconditional in their regard.

Engle (1961) investigated the ability of people to change as a function of their openness qualities. His subjects were the 110 teachers, principals, and supervisors included in a summer workshop. Changes in attitudes toward self and others, connotative meanings of educational concepts, and role descriptions of the ideal teacher were examined as functions of the openness characteristics of the subjects. Engle concluded that significant change occurred in the students on the variables of the study but that most of the change occurred in the subjects with openness scores above the median of the group.

Of direct importance in this proposal is a study by Freeze (1963). In his study, 145 secondary student teachers at the University of Alabama were measured for openness, by means of a Student Problems Q-sort he devised, both at the beginning and the end of their one semester student teaching experience. He also measured the openness of their supervising teachers (using a College Teacher Problems Q-sort devised by Bills, a copy of which is appended) and of their cooperating teachers. By means of a modified form of Barrett-Lennard's Relationship Inventory, he was able to support the validity of his Student Problems Q-sort as a measure of openness. Although changes in openness were in the predicted direction (increase in openness during student teaching), they were not sufficiently large to be statistically significant, thus, he could not conclude that the group as a whole had changed in a positive direction in openness qualities. (A copy of Freeze's Student Problems Q-sort is appended.)

Freeze then divided his supervising and cooperating teachers into two groups according to the median openness score for each group and examined the direction of change in the student teachers as a function of the openness qualities of their supervising and cooperating teachers. He found no reason to believe that student teachers taught by cooperating and supervising teachers, both of whom were above the median in openness, had changed in openness. Nor was there any reason to conclude that student teachers taught by cooperating and supervising teachers of mixed type (one above the median for his group and the other below the median for his group) experienced significant change in openness scores. But significant changes of a negative type occurred in the openness scores of student teachers taught by cooperating and supervising teachers both of whom were below the median of their groups in openness.

Freeze's study showed that during the emotionally difficult period of student teaching, positive changes in openness of student teachers did not occur, neither did a negative change appear which might have been predicted from the difficult nature of this situation for student teachers. Does this mean that student teaching is an effective way of introducing students to teaching relationships while maintaining their openness?

Freeze's study had several limitations. It dealt with the student teachers of only one institution and only with those involved in preparation for secondary

teaching. A more serious limitation of his study resulted from the openness qualities of his college supervisors and cooperating teachers. By comparison with data from other sources it must be concluded that both of these groups were atypical--the college supervisors represented a superior group as judged by their openness scores and the cooperating teachers represented a group considerably below average in openness. Thus, in most instances student teachers were taught by a mixed type of supervising and cooperating teacher and only a limited number of cases, taught by the other types were available for study.

Objectives of the Study

Although Freeze's pioneer study answered some important questions, it raised even more important ones. Would increasing the number of institutions involved, broadening the geographical distribution of the subjects of the study, including both elementary and secondary student teachers, and obtaining a more representative group of cooperating teachers overcome the limitations of Freeze's study and provide the information on which to base firm conclusions?

The present study was designed to seek answers for the following six questions:

1. Do significant positive changes occur in the openness of student teachers (as a group) during student teaching?

2. Are the changes in openness of individual student teachers which occur during student teaching related to the openness of their supervising and/or cooperating teachers?

3. Are the changes in the openness of individual student teachers which occur during student teaching related to student teachers' perceptions of their relationships with their supervising and/or cooperating teachers?

4. Is the openness of supervising and cooperating teachers the better predictor of direction of change in openness of student teachers or is the perceived quality of their relationships the better predictor?

5. What are the effects of various combinations of openness and relationship qualities on the part of cooperating and supervising teachers on openness in student teachers? (It is predicted that if both the cooperating teacher and the supervising teacher are above the medians of their groups in either of these characteristics, that students will gain in openness, that if both are below the medians that the change in openness of the student will be negative, and if one is above his median the other below (mixed type) that no significant change will occur in the student.

6. Will Freeze's Student Problems Q-sort show comparable validity as a predictor of perceived relationships as it did in his study?

The above questions when stated as hypotheses were the major concerns of the study.

Design of the Study

Six Alabama colleges participated in the study. These were Livingston State College, Alabama College, Stillman College, Florence State College, Birmingham-Southern College, and Howard College. (Note: In this report where data are given by college, the alphabetic order assigned to the colleges is not the same as that given here.)

At the beginning of the student teaching experience, all available student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervising teachers in the colleges used were tested for openness using the Student Problems Q-sort, the Teacher Problems Q-sort, and the College Teacher Problems Q-sort described earlier in this report. Depending on the schedule of the college, these tests were administered either at the beginning of the spring semester or the winter quarter.

At the end of the student teaching experience, student teachers were re-tested for openness with the Student Problems Q-sort and were asked to describe the quality of the relationships they perceived with their cooperating and supervising teachers using the same modified form of the Relationship Inventory as used in the studies by Emmerling (1961) and Freeze (1963) (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). At the time of the second tests, 22 randomly selected groups of high school students (grades 9 through 12) were asked to describe their relationships with their student teachers by means of the modified form of the Relationship Inventory.

Two hundred and sixty-one student teachers, enrolled for elementary and secondary student teaching in the six colleges, satisfactorily completed all necessary testing. The 22 randomly selected classes in grades 9 to 12 included 602 students who described their student teachers with the Relationship Inventory.

Group appointments were made with the student teachers at each of the six colleges and the Student Problems Q-sort was administered during these group sessions both at the beginning and the end of student teaching. During the second testing session the student teachers described the quality of their perceived relationships with their cooperating teachers and with their college supervisors.

Group appointments also were made with the supervising teachers at each of the six colleges and they were tested in these six groups. Nineteen supervising teachers thus were tested. These nineteen people gave the Teacher Problems Q-sort materials to the cooperating teachers with whom they worked and when they had been completed, each cooperating teacher mailed his returns to the project center. The 19 supervising teachers included all supervising teachers in the six colleges.

Two hundred and six cooperating teachers satisfactorily completed the Teacher Problems Q-sort which was given them by their supervising teachers

and returned by the cooperating teachers to the project center. The total group of cooperating teachers included 250 people. Of these, four were eliminated for failure to follow directions, 18 did not complete both tests, and 22 failed to respond to either test.

Relationship inventories, given the students in the 22 randomly selected classes, were administered in a regular class period without either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher being present.

Responses on all instruments were key-punched on IBM cards and later scored by a Univac Solid State 80 computer. This same computer was used for all data manipulations.

Instrumentation

The Teacher Problems Q-sort, described earlier, was developed by Bills from the descriptions of about 500 teachers in graduate classes. These teachers were asked to describe, briefly, the problems which gave them greatest concern as teachers. From the total one-sentence descriptions given by these teachers, 84 were selected as representative of the entire range of their concerns. Three judges working independently of each other then rated the problems for process-stasis characteristics using the dimensions that follow:

(1) Did the problem reflect a positive or negative attitude toward self, others, or things?

(2) Was the problem of a self or a non-self nature?

(3) Where was the locus of responsibility for the solution of the problem -- in the teacher or external to the teacher?

(4) Was the time orientation of the problem past, present, or future?

(5) Was the problem a problem or a symptom of a problem?

To illustrate, one teacher said his most pressing problem was "teaching boys and girls who had neither the ability nor the desire to learn." This is obviously a negative problem with its orientation in the present. The problem does not involve the self of the teacher and the locus of responsibility for doing something about the problem was outside the teacher. Furthermore, the problem as stated probably is a symptom rather than a problem, a more central problem being something such as, "the boys and girls are not learning as I think they should."

An illustration of the opposite type of problem is one in which the teacher said, "My most pressing problem is continuing to improve myself as a teacher."

This Q-sort is scored, using a modification of the technique outlined by Dymond (1953). The three judges who helped select the items were asked to rate each problem on each of the five dimensions with a rating reflecting a positive or

negative score depending on whether the problem was more characteristic of openness or closedness. Although there was remarkably high agreement among the judges on their ratings, only 39 problems are scored. These are the problems on which there was complete agreement among the judges.

As can be seen from the Teacher Problems Q-sort directions appended to this report, a subject is asked to sort the 84 problems into 11 piles with a predetermined number in each pile thus effecting a quasi-normal distribution. Since there are 11 categories, category 6 is in the center of the distribution and represents neither pressing or non-pressing problems. In scoring the sort, any of the 39 items placed in category 6 are ignored. A positive item placed to the right of category 6 (categories 7 through 11) scores 1+. A positive item placed to the left of category 6 (categories 1 through 5) scores 1-. The reverse is used for the items rated as negative or more typical of the closed person. Thus, the possible range of scores is from -39 to +39.

The validity of this method of scoring might be challenged but two methods of assessment suggest that the method produces reliable scores and studies already cited support the conclusion that the scores have predictive validity.

In the first method of assessment, the Q-sort descriptions of 145 student teachers (not subject's of the present study) given at the beginning and the end of a one semester period were correlated with each other. The consequent r's were converted to Fisher's z's and these were correlated with the discrepancies between the first and second openness scores derived from the same Q-sorts. The resulting Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was .65 showing that the two methods of manipulation of the data were in substantial agreement.

The second test of the validity of this method of scoring the Q-sort was made by intercorrelating all of the Q-sort descriptions given by the above 145 student teachers at the beginning of their student teaching experience. This resulted in a matrix of 10,440 correlation coefficients for which the median correlation was .2500. The 144 coefficients of each subject were then divided by the group median to give a score showing the number of coefficients for each subject which were at or above the group median and the number which were below the group median. The number of coefficients of each subject which were at or above the group median was then correlated with the Q-sort openness scores. The resulting Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was .70, again reflecting substantial agreement.

In a like manner the post-Q-sorts of the same 145 student teachers were examined and the resulting correlation coefficient was .72.

Taken together these results indicate a valid method of scoring the Q-sort for openness. It should be noted that the use of a score has several advantages over the usual correlational methods of treating Q-sorts. First, a score gives an independent variable on which subjects can be divided for study. Second, a score can be used in test-retest fashion to tell the amount and the direction of change of a person.

Copies of the Student Problems Q-sort and the modified form of the Relationship Inventory used in the study are appended.

Data

The study included 261 student teachers from the six colleges, their 19 supervisors and 206 cooperating teachers. The student teachers sorted the Student Problems Q-sort at both the beginning and end of their student teaching and also described their supervising and cooperating teachers at the end of the student teaching experience by means of the Relationship Inventory. The cooperating teachers sorted the problems of the Teacher Problems Q-sort and supervising teachers sorted the problems of the College Teacher Problems Q-sort. In addition, the high school students in 22 randomly selected classes completed the Relationship Inventory to describe their student teachers.

Although 261 student teachers were included in the study, at certain points in the data analysis this N will be only 229 since all cooperating teachers did not return their Q-sorts. Likewise, at other points the N for the student teachers is only 226 since some of the student teachers did not respond to the Relationship Inventory describing their cooperating teachers.

Data will be presented following a presentation of the question for which an answer is sought. In each case we have raised a question. It should be understood that at all points we have logically projected positive hypothetical answers to the questions and are, in reality, testing null hypotheses.

(1) Do significant changes occur in the openness of student teachers as a group during student teaching?

To answer this question the 261 student teachers' pre- and post-test openness scores, as obtained from the Student Problems Q-sorts, were compared and the differences in scores from pre- to post-test were calculated. The mean of the differences was -4.632 with an estimated standard error of 1.027. These statistics yielded a t ratio of 4.510 which with 260 degrees of freedom is significant at less than the .001 level of confidence.

Further analyses of student teachers changes in Q-sort scores were undertaken to determine possible differences in changes of secondary and elementary student teachers. The student teachers thus were divided into two groups; secondary and elementary student teachers.

The changes in the 190 secondary student teachers' openness scores from the pre- to post-test were examined. There was a mean change of -4.389 which had an estimated standard error of 1.185. These statistics yielded a t of 3.703 which with 189 degrees of freedom is significant at less than the .001 level of confidence.

The 71 elementary student teachers' scores also were examined for differences. During student teaching there was a mean decline of -5.281 in openness and this difference had an estimated standard error of 2.063. These statistics yielded a t ratio of 2.559 which with 70 degrees of freedom is significant at less than the .05 level of confidence.

Table 1 contains a summary of the changes in openness scores for elementary student teachers, secondary student teachers, for all student teachers combined, and the t ratios and probabilities obtained.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN STUDENT TEACHERS' OPENNESS SCORES BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-TEST

TEACHING LEVEL	N	ESTIMATED STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE	MEAN DIFFERENCE	t	p
ELEMENTARY	71	2.063	-5.281	2.559	.05
SECONDARY	190	1.185	-4.389	3.703	.001
TOTAL	261	1.027	-4.632	4.510	.001

Student teachers' changes in openness scores also were examined by college groups. Table 2 contains a summary of these differences and their levels of significance. All mean differences in student Q-sort scores were negative, however, all were not significant. Two of the six groups yielded changes that were significant at less than the .05 level and one of the six groups showed a change significant at less than the .01 level.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN STUDENT TEACHERS' OPENNESS SCORES BY COLLEGES

COLLEGE	N	ESTIMATED STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE	MEAN DIFFERENCE	t	p
A	43	3.312	-7.813	2.143	.05
B	16	1.320	-4.062	3.007	.01
C	91	1.902	-3.252	1.707	n.s.
D	54	2.115	-5.407	2.556	.05
E	16	4.689	-5.187	1.106	n.s.
F	41	2.221	-3.341	1.501	n.s.

One further analysis was made of student teachers' changes in process scores. This was a comparison with a 50 - 50 prediction of change. Table 3 presents the data used to test the prediction of changes in openness in student teachers from pre- to post-test. It was not expected that the non-parametric test on which the results of table 3 are based would show anything different from what was shown by the already presented tests of mean differences. This test is included, though, to give a comparison similar to those used in the data which follow. Thus, it is possible to study the results of the project through consistent statistical tests.

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN Q-SORT SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS WITH EXPECTED (CHANGE) CHANGE

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	OBSERVED CHANGED	EXPECTED CHANGE
+	99	114.5
-	130	114.5
TOTALS	229	229

Chi-Square = 4.20

p. .05

A chi-square computed for the data in Table 3 had a value of 4.20 which with 1 degree of freedom is significant at less than the .05 level. Thus, statistically significant negative changes in the openness of student teachers occurred during student teaching.

(2) Are the changes in the openness scores of individual student teachers which occurred during student teaching related to the openness scores of their supervising and/or cooperating teachers?

To answer this question, cooperating teachers' and college supervisors' openness scores on the Teacher Problems Q-sort and College Teacher Problems Q-sort were obtained. The college supervisors were then divided by the median score of their group into two groups -- at and above the median and below the median. A plus sign was assigned those supervisors whose scores were at or above the median and a minus sign was assigned those supervisors whose scores fell below the median.

In a similar manner the cooperating teachers were divided at their median score on the Teacher Problems Q-sort. A plus sign was assigned those cooperating teachers whose scores were at or above the median and a minus sign was assigned those whose scores were below the median.

Student teachers thus could be matched with four possible combinations of plus or minus scores from their supervisors and cooperating teachers. Therefore, a student teacher's change score (plus or minus score) could be placed under one of four headings -- plus plus (++), plus minue (+-), minus plus (-+), or minus minus (--). In the following discussion, the first sign will refer to the cooperating teacher and the second sign will refer to the college supervisor.

Table 4 presents a summary of the positive and negative changes in openness scores of student teachers as a function of openness scores of their cooperating and supervising teachers.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN OPENNESS IN STUDENT TEACHERS AS A FUNCTION OF OPENNESS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS

DIRECTION OF CHANGE OF STUDENT TEACHERS OPENNESS SCORES	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP* ++	+-	-+	--	TOTAL
+	34	17	32	16	99
-	50	24	36	20	130
TOTAL	84	41	68	36	229

* Experience Group refers to a cooperating teacher and college supervisor whose signs are plus or minus

Chi-Square = .71

Not Significant

Table 4 shows the number of student teachers who made negative or positive changes in each of the four experience groups. A chi-square of .71 was obtained from this distribution and with 3 degrees of freedom was not significant. Thus, significant changes in openness scores were not observed as a function of the openness qualities of the cooperating and supervising teachers considered together.

In order to determine differential effects of the cooperating and supervising teachers on the openness scores of student teachers, the data in Table 4 were examined in relation to two groups; one formed by adding together the plus plus and plus minus groups of Table 4 and one formed by adding together the minus plus and minus minus groups of Table 4. The independent variable was the sign of the cooperating teacher in both groups. In this way the sign of the college supervisor was held constant while the sign of the cooperating teacher varied. The distribution thus obtained is included in Table 5.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS CHANGING IN OPENNESS AS A FUNCTION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS
(Characteristics of the college supervisor held constant)

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP ++ and +–	–+ and ––	TOTAL
+	51	48	99
-	74	56	130
TOTAL	125	104	229

Chi-Square = 11.638
p. .001

The data in Table 5 yielded a chi-square of 11.638 which with 1 degree of freedom has a probability of less than .001. This indicates that the significant decrease in student teachers' openness scores noted earlier is a function of the openness characteristics of their cooperating teachers.

The data also were examined in relation to two other groups; one formed by adding together the plus plus and minus plus groups of table 4, and one formed by adding together the plus minus and minus minus groups of table 4. The independent variable here was the sign of the college supervisor. In this way the sign of the cooperating teacher was held constant while the sign of the supervising teacher varied. The distribution thus obtained is included in Table 6.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS WHO CHANGED IN OPENNESS AS A FUNCTION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COLLEGE SUPERVISORS
(CHARACTERISTICS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS HELD CONSTANT)

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP ++ and –+	+– and ––	TOTAL
+	66	33	99
-	86	44	130
TOTAL	152	77	229

Chi-Square .0064
Not Significant

The data in Table 6 yielded a chi-square of .0064 which with 1 degree of freedom was not significantly different from chance. This indicates that the decrease in student teachers' openness scores was not a function of the openness characteristics of their college supervisors.

The data, thus, indicate that the significant changes which occurred in the openness scores of student teachers were not significantly related to the openness of their cooperating teachers and supervising teachers considered as teams. Considered separately the openness characteristics of cooperating teachers were found to be significantly related to student teachers' decreased openness scores but no such relationship was apparent for the supervising teachers.

(3) Are the changes in the openness scores of individual student teachers which occur during student teaching related to the student teachers' perceptions of their relationships with their supervising and/or cooperating teachers?

To answer this question the Relationship Inventory descriptions given cooperating teachers and college supervisors by their student teachers were examined. As with the process scores, the college supervisors were divided at the median on their total Relationship Inventory scores. A plus sign was assigned those scores at or above the median and a minus sign was assigned those scores below the median. In a similar manner the cooperating teachers were divided at the median on their Relationship Inventory scores. A plus was assigned those scores at or above the median and a minus was assigned those scores below the median.

Student teachers were rated plus or minus, depending on the type of change they experienced, as shown by the College Student Problems Q-sort, and these changes were tabulated under the four possible combinations of Relationship Inventory scores of their cooperating and supervising teachers. Thus, a student teacher's change score was placed under one of four headings -- plus plus, plus minus, minus plus, or minus minus. In the following discussion, the first sign will refer to the cooperating teacher and the second sign will refer to the college supervisor. Table 7 presents a summary of these data.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN OPENNESS SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS AS A FUNCTION OF THE RELATIONSHIP SCORES OF THEIR COOPERATING AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS

DIRECTION OF CHANGE OF STUDENT TEACHER	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP ++	+-	-+	--	TOTAL
+	23	24	24	26	97
-	35	28	28	38	129
TOTAL	58	52	52	64	226

Chi-square .84
Not Significant

The chi-square computed from the data in Table 7 was .84 which with three degrees of freedom is not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the student teachers changes in openness was not related to the qualities they perceived in their cooperating teachers and college supervisors when the data were considered in pairs.

In order to determine possible differential effects of the cooperating and supervising teachers, the data in Table 7 were examined in relation to two groups; one formed by adding together the plus plus and plus minus groups of Table 7 and one formed by adding together the minus plus and minus minus groups of Table 7. The independent variable was the sign of the cooperating teacher. The distribution thus obtained is included in Table 8.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS CHANGING IN OPENNESS AS A FUNCTION OF THE PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS
(CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS HELD CONSTANT)

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP ++ and +-	-+ and --	TOTAL
+	47	50	97
-	63	66	129
TOTAL	110	116	226

Chi-Square .003

Not Significant

The data in Table 8 yielded a chi-square of .003 which with 1 degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level. This indicates that the decrease in student teachers' openness scores was not a function of the perceived relationships with their cooperating teachers.

The data also have been examined in relation to two additional groups; one formed by adding together the plus plus and minus plus of Table 7 and the other formed by adding together the plus minus and minus minus of Table 7. The independent variable was the sign of the college supervisor in both groups. The distribution thus obtained is included in Table 9.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS CHANGING IN OPENNESS AS A FUNCTION OF THE PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COLLEGE SUPERVISORS
(CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COOPERATING TEACHERS HELD CONSTANT)

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	TYPE OF EXPERIENCE GROUP		TOTAL
	++ and -+	+- and --	
+	47	50	97
-	63	66	129
TOTAL	110	116	226

Chi-Square .003

Not Significant

The data in Table 9 yielded a chi-square of .003 which with 1 degree of freedom was not significantly different from chance. This indicates that the decrease in student teachers' openness scores was not a function of their perceived relationships with their college supervisors.

This section has been concerned with the question -- are the changes in the openness scores of student teachers which occur during student teaching related to the student teachers' perceptions of their relationships with their supervising and/or cooperating teachers? The data indicate that the changes in openness of the student teachers were not significantly related to the qualities they perceived in their cooperating teachers, their college supervisors, or in a combination of the two.

(4) Is the openness of supervising and cooperating teachers the better predictor of change in openness of student teachers or is the perceived quality of their relationships with their supervising and cooperating teachers the better predictor?

Data analyzed for the two previous questions indicate that the changes in openness of the student teachers were significantly associated with the openness of their cooperating teachers but not that of their college supervisors. However, these changes were not related to the manner in which the students perceived their cooperating teachers or college supervisors. Thus, the openness of cooperating teachers was the better predictor of change.

(5) In a replication study, will Freeze's College Student Problems Q-sort show the same validity as a predictor of perceived relationships as it did in his study?

To answer this question 22 secondary school classes taught by student teachers were selected at random and asked to complete the Relationship Inventory

to describe their perceptions of their student teachers. On the basis of their post-test scores on the College Student Problems Q-sorts, student teachers were divided into two groups -- a more open group, and a less open group. Student teachers who scored at or above the median were placed in the more open group and those who scored below the median were placed in the less open group. The scores given them by their students were then tabulated in the appropriate columns. The difference between means was then analyzed by a t test. Four subscores and the total scores of the Relationship Inventory were treated in this manner. Table 10 contains a summary of these differences for level of regard, empathic understanding, unconditionality of regard, congruence, and the total subscores, the t ratios obtained, and their respective probabilities.

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MORE AND LESS OPEN STUDENT TEACHER GROUPS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR 22 CLASSES ON THE RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

VARIABLES	MEAN OF MORE OPEN GROUP (N = 285)	MEAN OF LESS OPEN GROUP (N = 317)	ESTIMATED STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE	MEAN DIFFERENCE	t	p
LEVEL OF REGARD	23.69	25.64	1.400	-1.950	1.392	n.s.
EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING	11.34	15.68	1.233	-4.340	3.548	.001
UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD	8.84	9.14	1.134	- .300	.264	n.s.
CONGRUENCE	18.42	22.86	1.160	-4.440	3.827	.001
TOTAL SCORES	62.29	73.32	4.255	-11.030	2.592	.01

A computed t ratio for the total scores in Table 10 gave a value of 2.592 which with 600 degrees of freedom is significant at the .01 level. Empathic understanding and congruence showed significant differences at less than the .001 level of confidence. Thus, the data indicate that the less open student teachers were perceived by their students as having provided qualities of empathic understanding, congruence and total relationship scores to a significantly greater degree than the more open group of student teachers.

In the preceding analyses of the data, changes in openness of student teachers were examined as a function of the characteristics of their supervising and cooperating teachers. In these analyses it was found that significant negative changes in openness of student teachers, as a group, occurred and that these changes were significantly related to the openness of their college supervisors. Thus, changes in the openness of the student teachers were examined as a function of the openness of their cooperating teachers.

In the section which follows, changes in openness of student teachers were examined as a function of the differential effects of the openness of cooperating teachers on students who were above average in openness at the beginning of student teaching and those who were below average in openness at the beginning of student teaching. It was hypothesized earlier that both the cooperating teachers and the supervising teachers would exert differential effects on more or less open students. Previous analyses failed, though, to isolate an effect of the college supervisor on student teachers and thus, the college supervisors have been dropped from the analyses which follow.

Table 11 presents a summary of the number of more open student teachers who gained or lost in openness during student teaching as a function of the openness of their cooperating teachers.

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF MORE OPEN STUDENT TEACHERS WHO GAINED OR LOST IN OPENNESS DURING STUDENT TEACHING AS A FUNCTION OF THE OPENNESS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS

COOPERATING TEACHERS	LOSS IN OPENNESS	GAIN IN OPENNESS	TOTAL
MORE OPEN	48	21	69
LESS OPEN	40	7	47
TOTAL	88	28	116

Chi-square = 3.722
Not Significant

The data in Table 11 yielded a chi-square of 3.722 which with 1 degree of freedom fails to reach significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus, the more

open students were not differentially influenced by the openness of their cooperating teachers.

A second comparison was made of the gain and loss in openness of students as a function of their cooperating teachers. Table 12 presents a summary of the number of less open student teachers who gained or lost in openness during student teaching as a function of the openness of their cooperating teachers.

In Table 12 the data indicate that there was no significant shift in the openness scores of the less open group of student teachers as a function of the openness scores of their cooperating teachers.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF LESS OPEN STUDENT TEACHERS WHO GAINED OR LOST IN OPENNESS DURING STUDENT TEACHING AS A FUNCTION OF THE OPENNESS OF THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS

COOPERATING TEACHERS	LOSS IN OPENNESS	GAIN IN OPENNESS	TOTAL
MORE OPEN	26	31	57
LESS OPEN	20	33	53
TOTAL	46	64	110

Chi-Square 1.54
Not Significant

One question remained unanswered, did the negative change in openness during student teaching occur equally in both the more open and less open student teachers? Data for this analysis are included in Table 13.

TABLE 13

A COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF CHANGES IN OPENNESS OF THE MORE AND LESS OPEN GROUP OF STUDENT TEACHERS

DIRECTION OF CHANGE	MORE OPEN STUDENT TEACHERS	LESS OPEN STUDENT TEACHERS	TOTAL
GAIN	28	64	92
LOSS	88	46	134
TOTAL	116	110	226

Chi-Square 27.11
p .0001

Data from Table 13 yielded a chi-square of 27.11 which with 1 degree of freedom is significant at less than the .001 level of confidence. Thus, considerable change was observed for both groups of student teachers with considerable evidence that regression to the mean had occurred. It was noted that 75.9 per cent of the more open student teachers decreased in openness during student teaching while 58.2 per cent of the less open students increased in openness during student teaching. Was the loss of the more open students greater than the gain of the less open students?

A test of the significance of the difference between the two percentages was made. The estimated standard error of the difference between the two percentages was .0194 and the mean difference was .1770. This yielded a t ratio of 9.124 which with 224 degrees of freedom was significant at less than the .001 level. Thus, it is concluded that the change was more than regression toward the mean and that the significant negative changes in openness noted earlier occurred more frequently in the more open than in the less open group.

This section dealt with the following hypotheses with conclusions as noted:

(1) An open student teacher with an open cooperating teacher will remain open during his student teaching experience and will, perhaps, become more open, whereas an open student teacher with a less open cooperating teacher will become less open.

The data do not support this hypothesis.

(2) A less open student teacher in relationship with an open cooperating teacher will move toward openness during his student teaching experience, whereas a less open student teacher with a less open cooperating teacher will not change.

The data do not support this hypothesis.

(3) An open student teacher with a less open cooperating teacher will become less open during student teaching whereas a less open student teacher with a more open cooperating teacher will become more open.

The data do not support this hypothesis.

(4) A student who is less open and who is given a relationship in which the college supervisor and cooperating teacher differ in their degree of openness will show no significant change in openness characteristics.

Data were not examined for this hypothesis since no measurable effect of the college supervisor was isolated.

Summary of Results

(1) Significant negative changes occurred in the openness of the student teachers during their student teaching. These negative changes occurred for both

elementary and secondary student teachers but did not occur to the same degree for students in all of the colleges which were studied.

(2) Changes in openness of student teachers were significantly related to the openness of their cooperating teachers but not to the openness of their college supervisors. The more open the cooperating teacher, the more the student teacher lost in openness.

(3) Changes in openness of student teachers were not significantly related to the qualities they perceived in their cooperating teachers, college supervisors, or a combination of the two.

(4) The openness of cooperating teachers was a better predictor of change in student teachers' openness than was the perceived quality of their cooperating teachers. Changes in openness of student teachers were significantly related to the openness of their cooperating teachers but not to the perceived qualities of their cooperating teachers.

(5) The relationship variables were significantly related to the openness scores of student teachers on the College Student Problems Q-sort. High school students perceived their less open student teachers as more empathic and congruent than their more open student teachers.

(6) When the negative changes in openness during student teaching were examined it was determined that the significant factor was the decrease in openness of the student teachers who were more open at the beginning of student teaching. Student teachers who were less open showed less change in openness during student teaching.

(7) Increases and decreases in the openness of student teachers during their student teaching experience when examined as a function of the level of their original degree of openness and the openness of their cooperating teachers, were not found to be related.

Discussion

The results of this study showed that student teachers changed significantly and negatively in openness during student teaching. While these changes in openness were not significantly related to the openness qualities of their college supervisors, they were significantly related to the openness of their cooperating teachers. Why did these changes occur? Although a definitive explanation of why the above changes occurred is not possible, an explanation may lie in the context of student teaching and the nature of student teachers' reactions to it.

Student teaching comes in most colleges during the last year of undergraduate study. It is a culmination of four years of experience and preparation which the student often approaches with the question, "Will I measure up?" Of considerable concern to the student are questions such as, "What happens to me if I do not make the grade?" "Will I be able to control my class?" "How do you discipline students?" "How do you help students respect you?" "Will my best be acceptable to this cooperating teacher whom I don't even know?" "What does my cooperating teacher expect of me?" "Can I really help boys and girls learn significantly?"

In other words, the questions of students as they enter student teaching reflect anxiety in respect to personal adequacy, adequacy as a teacher, adequacy in the eyes of students, and adequacy in the eyes of the cooperating teacher. Personal observation by the authors of this study, when serving as supervising teachers, seems to show that students in their supervising groups are exceedingly tense and anxious before they meet their cooperating teachers. After they meet their cooperating teachers there is some reduction in anxiety but it again mounts when the student teacher is asked to take over for the cooperating teacher. At this point many student teachers report that they believe they must attempt to teach as their cooperating teachers do in order to be rewarded by them with "good" marks. Thus, the student teacher often is attempting to discover how to behave in order to be rewarded regardless of his perceptions of the teaching-learning situation and he is not attempting to discover himself as a teacher or as a tool for student learning. He seeks to play a role rather than to implement himself as a means for students to learn. To a significant degree the future success of the student teacher rests on his success in student teaching.

In such a tension producing situation it is not surprising that the negative results determined in this study occur. Indeed, it would be surprising if positive changes were noted.

Also in such a situation it is not surprising that the supervising teacher is exerting so little an effect. Although the supervising teacher meets with his students frequently and although he will later observe the student in his teaching, the student's concern is more likely centered in the cooperating teacher and more especially since supervising teachers traditionally do not observe until after a number of teaching sessions by the student teacher.

It is also not surprising that in such a perceived situation the more open students show greater negative change than do the less open students. The more open the student, the more he will react to the potentially threatening situation existing in student teaching. The data collected in this study support this notion.

Likewise, it is not surprising that student teachers show less negative change in contact with less open cooperating teachers. The more open cooperating teachers appear to induce greater negative change in their student teachers. The behavior of less open people is less variable, more inclined toward rigidity, is more likely to be repetitive, and is more direct than is the behavior of more open people. The less open the cooperating teacher, the easier it is for the student teacher to discern what is expected of him. It also follows that it is easier for a more open student teacher to discern what is expected of him by less open cooperating teachers and more obvious to him that what is expected may be in contradiction to his own basic ways of behaving. In other words, the threat from a less open cooperating teacher is probably greater for a more open student teacher than for a less open student teacher.

Students who are taught by student teachers often report difficulty in understanding what is expected of them and in reacting to the "new broom" which is their student teacher. In addition, today's students are under constant threat of unacceptable marks which will seriously condition their futures. In such a context it is easy to believe that students will rate more highly those student teachers

who are specific in their assignments, requirements, and examinations. Although the less open student teacher may not be most helpful for the learning of the students in the long run, they may be more highly rated by their students than are more open student teachers who may also be less specific, more student centered, less directive, and, in this situation, more anxious.

The greatest threats people experience are in their relations with important other people. The cooperating teacher is an important other person for the student teacher; he may not be an important other person for the cooperating teacher. The student teacher finds himself in a situation in which he must win the regard of his cooperating teacher. In this situation the student teacher is first asked to observe and then to teach. The observation-teaching sequence may act to develop a "set" in which the student reasons that he must teach like his cooperating teacher. The more open the student teacher, the more threat this will pose.

And in this situation the more open the cooperating teacher, the greater may be the threat for the open student teacher. If the student teacher believes that he must discover the appropriate behavior for which his cooperating teacher will reward him, and if his cooperating teacher desires for him to find his own best way but does not communicate this message because of the potentially threatening nature of student teaching, it becomes obvious that threat will increase and negative change in student openness will occur.

On the other hand, the more restricted behavior of the less open student teacher may be an asset for him with either a more or a less open cooperating teacher. A less open student teacher with a less open cooperating teacher may find himself in a situation in which he can teach like the cooperating teacher and not be in conflict. A less open student teacher in contact with a more open cooperating teacher may not recognize the freedom he has to experiment with his teaching but in doing only that which is consistent with his own perceptions may be rewarded for it.

The negative results of this study may be contrasted with the positive changes noted in Engle's study (1961). In Engle's study a workshop group was given a student-centered experience. The group members evidenced positive change as a result of the experience although the change was far greater for the more open members than for the less open members. In Engle's group there were many opportunities for contact between group member and leader. Furthermore, the task of the student was defined in advance to be the development of plans for the next teaching year. All that had to be communicated was that as a student "you are expected to make your own decisions." In student teaching, though, the requirement may appear to the student to be that he must "be" in some way which is acceptable to the cooperating teacher.

One of the major aspects of the present study was an attempt to relate change in student teachers to the openness of their cooperating teachers or to their perceptions of their relationships with their cooperating teachers. It was predicted that perceived relationships would be more highly correlated with change in openness than would be the openness of cooperating and supervising teachers. Changes in openness of student teachers as a function of the perceived

relationships they had with their cooperating and supervising teachers did not appear in the study. The lack of a relationship between change in openness of the student teachers and their perceptions of their supervising teachers appears to be consistent with the major findings of the study--the supervising teachers of this study did not appear to exert a significant effect on their student teachers.

The lack of a significant relationship between change in openness of student teachers and their perceptions of their relationships with their cooperating teachers may show that no significant relationship exists or it may reflect an inadequacy of the data since in the study student teachers were not asked to write their names on the relationship inventories they completed to describe their supervising and cooperating teachers. Student teachers did identify the person they were describing. Thus, cooperating teachers and supervising teachers who had more than one student teacher could not be matched with the relationship inventory scores of individual student teachers. Because of this the data included the average relationship descriptions given by all of the student teachers of a particular cooperating or supervising teacher. In other words, all students of one teacher were considered to have described the supervising or cooperating teacher with the mean score given that teacher. Such a procedure obscured individual differences.

This study showed one result opposite to that of Freeze's study (1963). In his study, pupils described their more open student teachers as effecting more desirable relationships with them but data from the present study indicate that the less open student teachers were described by their pupils as having more desirable relationships. One possibility is that this is not a stable conclusion. A second possibility is that the schools are in a time of rapid change and demands on students for high achievement are increasing rapidly. If this is correct, then the less open student teachers may be seen as having more effective relationships because of their more specific demands.

On the other hand the manner of selection of the 18 secondary school classes used in Freeze's study was considerably different from the method used to select the 22 secondary school classes of the present study and the methods yielded different results.

Freeze selected 18 student teachers as his subjects. These 18 people were selected to represent the extremes of openness within his group of subjects. The student teachers thus selected as more open had a mean score of 36.20 on the College Student Problems Q-sort with a standard deviation of 3.97 and with a range of scores from 32 to 43. The teachers who were identified as less open had a mean score on the College Student Problems Q-sort of -2.63. The standard deviation of the group was 7.62 with a range from -15 to 7. Thus, Freeze's method of selection of the two groups necessarily resulted in scoring ranges that did not overlap and that were distinctly different. The lowest score of the more open group was higher than the highest score of the less open group.

In the present study 22 classes taught by student teachers were selected at random. Later the student teachers were divided into more and less open group on the basis of the median score of the group. The 11 student teachers identified as the more open group had a mean score on the College Student Problems Q-sort

of 35. 14 and a standard deviation of 11. 93 and a range from 29 to 45. The 11 student teachers identified as the less open group had a mean openness score of 15. 45 with a standard deviation of 18. 03 and a range from -33 to 28. The differences in these groups were not nearly so great as in Freeze's study.

Implications of the Study

This study indicates that student teaching is an experience in which negative changes in openness can occur. Because of the importance of openness as a variable in teacher relationships and pupil development, this appears to be a highly undesirable outcome.

The study also indicates that supervising teachers who were included are not exerting a significant influence on the development of student teachers. This does not appear to be a desirable outcome, either, since the supervising teacher is almost always a more adequately prepared person than is the cooperating teacher.

Although the results of the study give cause for concern, they also suggest some ways of relieving the conditions which were noted. These are given in the form of the questions which follow.

1. To what extent would a teacher preparation program which aims to produce openness in its students throughout the four year undergraduate program develop students who are practiced in making their own decisions and thus better equipped for the threatening experience of student teaching?

2. To what extent would student teachers who have been given limited classroom responsibility prior to student teaching and throughout the preparation program show more positive changes during student teaching?

3. To what extent would closer working relationships among cooperating teachers, supervising teachers, and student teachers result in more positive gains for the student teachers?

4. The subjects of this study did not represent an exceptionally open group of student teachers and showed negative change during student teaching but would a more open group show the same results?

5. Are there better ways to organize for student teaching such as groups of students who observe and then discuss among themselves, student teaching without observation by the supervising and cooperating teacher, student teaching without evaluation and only with the effort to take the student teacher where he is and help him improve to the greatest extent possible?

Answers to these questions appear important and could be the basis of further study.

Summary of Conclusions

1. Significant negative change occurred in the openness of student teachers during their student teaching. This negative change occurred for both elementary and secondary student teachers but did not occur to the same extent for all six colleges involved in the study.

2. The significant negative changes in the openness of student teachers were significantly related to the openness of their cooperating teachers but not to the openness of their college supervisors.

3. The changes in openness of the student teachers were not related to the qualities they perceived in their relationships with their cooperating teachers, their supervising teachers, or to a combination of the two.

4. Changes in openness of student teachers were significantly related to the openness qualities of their cooperating teachers but not to the perceived qualities of their cooperating teachers.

5. There is a significant relationship between the quality of the relationship high school students perceive they have with student teachers and the openness of the student teachers. In general, the more open the student teacher, the less positively is he perceived.

6. Although the student teachers as a group showed significant negative changes in openness, the change was greater for those who were more open at the beginning of student teaching.

7. No significant relationships in change in openness of student teachers occurred when these changes were examined as functions of the original degree of openness of the student, the openness of his cooperating teacher, and the openness of his supervising teacher.

REFERENCES

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs 76: 1962; No. 43.

Bills, R. E. Insights for Teaching from Personality Theory: Intelligence and Teaching. In Berman, Louise (ed.) The Nature of Teaching: Implications for the Education of Teachers. Milwaukee: School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1963. Chapter 4, pp. 49-64.

_____ Manual for Index of Adjustment and Values: High School, Junior High School, and elementary school forms. University: University of Alabama, 1963.

Dymond, Rosalind. An adjustment score for Q-sorts. J. Consult. Psychol. 17: 339-342, 1953.

Emmerling, F. A. A Study of the relationships between personality characteristics of classroom teachers and pupil perceptions of these teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1961.

Engle, H. A. A study of openness as a factor in change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1961.

Freeze, C. R. A study of openness as a factor in change of student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1963.

Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. J. Consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 95-103.

_____ A process conception of psychotherapy. Amer. Psychologist, 1958, 13, 142-149.

_____ A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In Koch, S. (Ed.) Psychology: a study of a science, III. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLLEGE STUDENT PROBLEMS Q-SORT
COLLEGE STUDENT PROBLEMS RECORD SHEET
COLLEGE STUDENT PROBLEMS Q-SORT ITEMS

Instructions

College Student Problems Q-sort

You have been given perforated sheets containing 84 problems. Separate these 84 problems into 84 slips. Each slip states a problem which may be of concern to you as a teacher. All 84 problems have been suggested by other teachers. We would like you to use these statements to describe the most pressing problems you experience as a teacher.

To describe the problems you experience as a teacher the statements are sorted as indicated below.

	Least Pressing								Most Pressing		
Category Number:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number of cards:	1	2	6	11	14	16	14	11	6	2	1

You must place one and only one statement in category #11. This is the one problem which is most pressing for you. Category #10 will contain the two (and only two) next most pressing problems. Category #9 will contain the next six most pressing problems, etc.

The easiest way to make the sort is to begin by dividing the 84 statements into three piles--"most pressing," "least pressing," and a third group between these. The three piles may then be subdivided into the final eleven piles.

After you have completed the sort, please record your responses on the record sheet. You will notice that each problem has a number. (Ignore the CSP on each item. It means College Student Problem.) Note the category in which you placed the problem and opposite the problem number on the record write the appropriate category number.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name:_____

Q-SORT

RECORD SHEET

College Student Problems

Problem No.	Category	Problem No.	Category	Problem No.	Category	Problem No.	Category
1		22		43		64	
2		23		44		65	
3		24		45		66	
4		25		46		67	
5		26		47		68	
6		27		48		69	
7		28		49		70	
8		29		50		71	
9		30		51		72	
10		31		52		73	
11		32		53		74	
12		33		54		75	
13		34		55		76	
14		35		56		77	
15		36		57		78	
16		37		58		79	
17		38		59		80	
18		39		60		81	
19		40		61		82	
20		41		62		83	
21		42		63		84	

Items for College Student Problems

1. Finding time to do the things I would like to do in light of the amount of work assigned to me (CSP)
2. College professors who are inefficient and who do not care whether students learn or not (CSP)
3. My lack of self-confidence (CSP
4. My lack of interest in my courses makes it difficult to study (CSP)
5. I am poorly organized and have difficulty in studying (CSP)
6. Poor planning by college administrators who allow too many students in the same class (CSP)
7. Not knowing how to adjust my behavior to please the professor (CSP)
8. Not having anyone with whom I can confide my innermost feelings about things that concern me (CSP)
9. The assignments given me in class are inadequate to meet my intellectual needs (CSP)
10. Receiving little or no cooperation from other students in organizational projects (CSP)
11. Too much nagging and pressure from parents to make good grades (CSP)
12. Having to take courses in college that offer no challenge or are outside my major field (CSP)
13. Inability to live by the moral standards I had prior to coming to college (CSP)
14. Professors who do not make subject matter interesting and meaningful for me (CSP)
15. Coping with social competition on the campus (CSP)
16. Not being asked for a date (girl)
    Being turned down when asking for a date (boy) (CSP)
17. Will the subject-matter I am studying be of value to me when I finish college (CSP)
18. So many students emphasize good grades rather than learning (CSP)
19. Emphasis that is placed on fraternities, sororities, and social life (CSP)
20. Lack of a uniform grading system for evaluating the progress of students (CSP)
21. Deciding what I will be and do when I finish college (CSP)
22. Assignments have little meaning because they are so often busy work forced on me (CSP)
23. Learning how to express my real views in class without having my grade lowered for it (CSP)
24. Helping my parents understand that it is not as easy to make high marks in college as in high school (CSP)
25. Being a number to my professor instead of an individual (CSP)
26. Professors who try to flunk out students and who tell the class this is their purpose instead of judging me on the basis of my achievement (CSP)
27. Inability to concentrate, read rapidly, and use the library effectively so I can do the work required of me (CSP)
28. Being required to go to class even when I could learn more if I were to study on my own (CSP)
29. Being required to memorize minute details in order to pass exams which makes it more difficult to grasp the larger ideas of the class (CSP)
30. Feeling guilty about the way I trust my friends (CSP)
31. Planning my time so that I do not get so involved in extra-curricular activities that I do not have time to study as much as I believe I should (CSP)

32. Being satisfied with my progress when I know I am capable of doing better work (CSP)
33. Not being able to get off by myself so that I can think and learn (CSP)
34. Learning how to express my feelings and opinions in a positive and helpful way in classes where professors disturb me (CSP)
35. Being unable to be myself and feeling I have to conform (CSP)
36. Professors who will not let me take responsibility for planning my college work (CSP)
37. Learning better ways to study and to distribute my time more wisely to achieve the things important to me (CSP)
38. Learning what is most important for me to do, to be, or to get from life (CSP)
39. Feeling afraid to speak up in class (CSP)
40. Learning to distinguish what is really important and what is "busy work" in a subject (CSP)
41. Learning better ways of evaluating my own work rather than merely accepting the evaluation of the professor (CSP)
42. Doing a better job of organizing my school work so as to have more time for a balanced life (CSP)
43. Learning how to know my professors better (CSP)
44. Fulfilling the expectations of my parents and trying to fulfill the expectations of my peer group at the same time (CSP)
45. Learning how to be friendly with students and professors so that they will like me and I, in turn, can profit from their experience (CSP)
46. Learning how to be responsible for my behavior (CSP)
47. Learning how to apply the knowledge I have learned (CSP)
48. Obeying the policies and regulations of the college (CSP)
49. Learning how to transfer what is learned in one course to another (CSP)
50. Learning to accept autocratic teaching and profiting as much as I can from it although I prefer the democratic approach (CSP)
51. Avoiding the easy course of action which may not do me the best good in the long run (CSP)
52. Growing in my desire to learn things because they are important rather than to pass a test (CSP)
53. Learning better ways of avoiding activities that are not central to my purposes in getting an education (CSP)
54. Finding better ways of gaining more from my courses than only that which I am required to gain (CSP)
55. Keeping away from the cheating which I see around me (CSP)
56. Wanting students and faculty to think well of me (CSP)
57. Finding better ways for me to express my feelings to my boy friend or girl friend (CSP)
58. Being able to understand the importance of what I am becoming for the future instead of being content with understanding only the present or past (CSP)
59. Learning how to balance my interest in the opposite sex and my need to study (CSP)
60. Over-crowded conditions of the college living quarters (CSP)
61. Avoiding students who take up my time with their problems (CSP)
62. Learning to accept teachers and students as they are (CSP)
63. Continuing to learn more about myself and what is important to me (CSP)
64. Trying to see myself as others see me (CSP)
65. Trying to be what important people think I should be (CSP)

66. Growing in my abilities to evaluate my needs (CSP)
67. Learning how to accept student and teacher reaction to me as a source of growth (CSP)
68. Learning better how to face the realities of college life (CSP)
69. Growing in my ability to find my own answers rather than merely accepting what my professors tell me (CSP)
70. Learning how to put forth the effort necessary to accomplish the things required of me (CSP)
71. Learning to use the ability and the talents I possess (CSP)
72. Learning better ways of expressing my individual needs and interest (CSP)
73. Helping my parents to understand that I also worry and have problems (CSP)
74. Inability to decide for myself what I should study in college (CSP)
75. Learning how to take sufficient time to reason out my problems (CSP)
76. Learning better ways of showing how much I really know when I take an exam (CSP)
77. Learning better ways of being helpful in patching up things between friends (CSP)
78. Increasing my ability to concentrate on important subjects that I am not interested in (CSP)
79. Getting my professors to teach me the things I should know (CSP)
80. Professors who criticize other schools or colleges on the campus (CSP)
81. Inability on the part of professors to solve my problems for me (CSP)
82. Lack of self-discipline among other college students (CSP)
83. Becoming more willing and able to see other people as they see themselves (CSP)
84. Feeling the professor sees me as a student who lacks the desire and the ability to succeed in college (CSP)

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS CO-OPERATING TEACHER PROBLEMS Q-SORT
TEACHER PROBLEMS Q-SORT ITEMS

Instructions

Teacher Problems Q-sort

You have been given perforated sheets containing 84 problems. Separate these 84 problems into 84 slips. Each slip states a problem which may be of concern to you as a teacher. All 84 problems have been suggested by other teachers. We would like you to use these statements to describe the most pressing problems you experience as a teacher.

To describe the problems you experience as a teacher the statements are sorted as indicated below.

	Least Pressing							Most Pressing			
Category Number:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number of cards:	1	2	6	11	14	16	14	11	6	2	1

You must place one and only one statement in category #11. This is the one problem which is most pressing for you. Category #10 will contain the two (and only two) next most pressing problems. Category #9 will contain next six most pressing problems, etc.

The easiest way to make the sort is to begin by dividing the 84 statements into three piles--"most pressing," "least pressing," and a third group between these. The three piles may then be subdivided into the final eleven piles.

After you have completed the sort, please record your responses on the record sheet. You will notice that each problem has a number. (Ignore the TP on each item. It means Teacher Problem.) Note the category in which you placed the problem and opposite the problem number on the record sheet write the appropriate category number.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Items for Teacher Problems Q-sort

1. How to make the subject matter interesting and meaningful to all pupils of varying ability (TP)
2. Teaching children who lack the desire to learn (TP)
3. Student's lack of knowledge of the fundamentals (TP)
4. How to keep children busy and to encourage them to use their time wisely (TP)
5. Working with parents in such a way that they have an opportunity to help define the school program (TP)
6. Trying to get students to apply the knowledge they have (TP)
7. Students wanting to be on an equal with teachers (TP)
8. How to become the most positive educational influence in the lives of my students that I can be (TP)
9. How to constantly change curricular practices to adjust to the latest ideas and research findings (TP)
10. Lack of concern of students in developing high standards (TP)
11. Lack of time to do what you think should be done in a particular subject (TP)
12. Lack of parents participating in PTA (TP)
13. How to develop responsibility of pupils for their behavior (TP)
14. Learning new ways of reaching the slow and fast learner (TP)
15. Immaturity of today's children (TP)
16. Getting children to put forth the necessary effort to accomplish the task assigned (TP)
17. How to decide how much time to spend in creative pursuits (TP)
18. Trying to teach children who do not have the ability to even following directions (TP)
19. Developing a school spirit (TP)
20. Children lack a sense of responsibility for their materials (TP)
21. I expect too much from my pupils--I am too anxious and ambitious for them (TP)
22. How, in spite of the many handicaps that face me, can I be the best possible teacher I can be (TP)
23. Finding time to use the added materials which we are receiving (TP)
24. I need to inspire the children to take more initiative (TP)
25. What to do with "bright" pupils to prevent their wasting time (TP)
26. Trying to teach a class with abilities that spread over four or five grade levels (TP)
27. Getting children to realize the importance of an education, and being willing to spend the necessary time and effort to achieve it (TP)
28. Lack of interest shown by students (TP)
29. How to give homework that will strengthen the subject matter presented in classroom instruction (TP)
30. Students who are not able to do the work required for their grade (TP)
31. Lack of interest among many parents whose children need parental guidance (TP)
32. Motivating children to want to do more than just pass (TP)
33. How to secure the cooperation of parents in carrying good habits over to the home (TP)
34. Lack of professional attitude on the part of other teachers (TP)
35. Lack of cooperation of other teachers and sometimes the administration in discipline problems (TP)

36. Communicating to parents the value of present-day teaching procedures (TP)
37. Helping children to learn to think for themselves and to be independent (TP)
38. Students who are satisfied with only a passing grade when they have the ability to do so much better (TP)
39. Adequate space for creative efforts (TP)
40. The mastery of more and better diagnostic techniques in the classroom for the better instruction of pupils (TP)
41. Inability on part of children to think for themselves (TP)
42. Finding time to do needed individual work with pupils (TP)
43. Too much emphasis on sports (TP)
44. Putting the subject matter over in a way that students can get the most out of it (TP)
45. Teaching pupils when "A" and "F" pupils are dumped into the same class (TP)
46. Not enough uniformity in what is expected of children from different teachers (TP)
47. Too many dropouts (TP)
48. Parents who feel that your job is to see that their child passes even though classes are much too large for individual attention (TP)
49. Getting quiet children to enter into class discussions (TP)
50. How can we maintain better parent-teacher relationships (TP)
51. Too much absenteeism (TP)
52. Getting all children to do assigned homework (TP)
53. Knowing how to motivate children to want to learn what is important (TP)
54. Learning new ways of helping children develop their maximal potentials through school work (TP)
55. Lack of materials to work with so that every child will have a chance to develop at his top level individually (TP)
56. Lack of appreciation of the job of the teacher in the community (TP)
57. Carrying out the policies formulated by others such as the principal or the superintendent (TP)
58. Parents whose emphasis is on the grading system rather than on the development of the individual child (TP)
59. Getting students to use wisely the abilities and talents they possess (TP)
60. Insufficient library materials for student-centered teaching (TP)
61. Changing classroom emphases to avoid the criticism of parents that our teaching is weak (TP)
62. Refusal of children who need individual help to accept it and correct mistakes on written work (TP)
63. Lack of set standards for judging progress or promotion (TP)
64. Changing teaching practices to fit the needs of individual students (TP)
65. Getting the children to listen (TP)
66. Lack of sufficient funds to accomplish what I'd like to accomplish (TP)
67. Children who cannot read or understand what they have read (TP)
68. Finding better and newer ways of relating subject matter to daily living (TP)
69. Sufficient time for teaching subject matter (TP)
70. Problems from socially promoted children (TP)
71. Not enough time to accomplish all I'd like to accomplish (TP)
72. Getting parents to understand the school program (TP)
73. Helping pupils express individual needs and interests (TP)
74. Inability of some students to have a spark of ambition (TP)
75. Children who are not interested in any type of homework or study at school (TP)

76. Learning better ways of evaluating pupil progress (TP)
77. Children who fail to give attention in class--poor attitudes (TP)
78. Teaching pupils who are not adequately prepared by the teachers before us (TP)
79. Some students feel they are different and think they should be treated as teachers are (TP)
80. Helping those in authority to re-think what may be arbitrary decisions (TP)
81. Continuing to develop new and better ways of getting students to participate and enter classwork with their fullest attention (TP)
82. Inability of some students to learn, and the fact that they retard or slow down the most intelligent ones in some instances (TP)
83. How to continue to improve my teaching in a fast-changing world (TP)
84. Although class work is all planned by the class, interest begins to fall away if any real obstacles arrive in working on our problems. I need to rethink my methods of work to prevent this (TP)

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS COLLEGE TEACHER PROBLEMS Q-SORT
COLLEGE TEACHER PROBLEMS Q-SORT ITEMS

Instructions

College Teacher Problems Q-sort

You have been given perforated sheets containing 84 problems. Separate these 84 problems into 84 slips. Each slip states a problem which may be of concern to you as a teacher. All 84 problems have been suggested by other teachers. We would like you to use these statements to describe the most pressing problems you experience as a teacher.

To describe the problems you experience as a teacher the statements are sorted as indicated below.

	Least Pressing								Most Pressing		
Category Number:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number of cards:	1	2	6	11	14	16	14	11	6	2	1

You must place one and only one statement in category #11. This is the one problem which is most pressing for you. Category #10 will contain the two (and only two) next most pressing problems. Category #9 will contain the next six most pressing problems, etc.

The easiest way to make the sort is to begin by dividing the 84 statements into three piles--"most pressing," "least pressing," and a third group between these. The three piles may then be subdivided into the final eleven piles.

After you have completed the sort, please record your responses on the record sheet. You will notice that each problem has a number. (Ignore the CTP on each item. It means College Teacher Problem.) Note the category in which you placed the problem and opposite the problem number on the record sheet write the appropriate category number.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Items for College Teacher Problems Q-sort

1. Getting to know students as individual people
2. Lack of necessary supplies and equipment
3. Becoming more effective in helping students want to learn what is important
4. Achieving professional security in an insecure profession
5. Identifying the best that is known about effective teaching and identifying the implications for my own teaching
6. Having to rely on undependable and inefficient secretarial help
7. Criticism from other members of the university (College)
8. Learning how to vary instruction to meet individual differences of students
9. Students taking courses they have no background in or ability to pass
10. Lack of time during a course to cover adequately the content included in the syllabus
11. Evaluating my own effectiveness as a teacher
12. Instructors who do not maintain adequate ethical standards
13. Effective utilization of time so that each class period contributes to achievement of the objectives of the course
14. Diagnosing individual student problems so that I know how to react and be of help
15. Learning new ways of helping students develop their maximum potentials through their studies
16. Becoming the most positive educational influence in the lives of my students that I can be
17. Teaching students who are more concerned about grades than their educational development
18. Helping students know how to apply knowledge
19. Continuing to develop new and better ways of getting students to participate and enter classwork with their fullest attention
20. Too much emphasis on sports and the extra-curricular
21. Changing classroom emphases to avoid the criticism of the public and other teachers that our teaching is weak
22. Students wanting to be on an equal with teachers
23. Learning better ways of approaching students to help them become increasingly self-directing
24. Inequalities of staff loads
25. Faculty members who are looking only for professional advancement
26. Helping other members of the staff to examine critical problems
27. Working with students, many of whom are inclined to be dependent
28. Helping students overcome their lack of preparation for college work
29. Inefficiency and ineptitude of some instructors makes it difficult for those of us who really want to help the students
30. Finding and budgeting time wisely to do the many professional things which a college teacher would like to do
31. The rapid tempo of education that causes students to charge through college effectively cheating themselves out of becoming educated
32. Apathy of many teachers to teaching
33. Learning newer ways of motivating students

34. Finding ways of sharing professional ideas among faculty members
35. Heterogenity of interests and preparation of students in advanced courses makes selection of adequate course content impossible
36. Finding interesting new approaches to old subject matter for new students
37. How to continue to improve my teaching in a fast-changing world
38. Lack of set standards for judging progress of students
39. Not enough uniformity in what is expected of students from different teachers
40. Helping those in authority over me to rethink arbitrary decisions
41. Chronic absenteeism
42. Students who lack a sense of responsibility
43. Lack of cooperation of other teachers and sometimes the administration in solving teaching problems
44. Immaturity of today's college students
45. Keeping abreast of what I am supposed to do in light of the institution's requirements
46. Lack of a scholarly environment
47. Administrative leadership which fails to "set our sights"
48. Teaching in a framework which does not permit me to follow self-identified problems of students
49. Making precise assignments so that I can be of greatest help to students
50. The poor quality of students emerging from high schools
51. Learning how to become a more effective counselor of students
52. Keeping up to date professionally in a rapidly changing field
53. How to remain open to new experience and to use it to continue to grow in effectiveness as a teacher
54. Students who lack the ability to profit from college work
55. The demonstrated lack of willingness of members of the professional staff to work together in a really cooperative way to develop a unity of purpose and function
56. Difficulty of getting students to do as much independent reading as I think they should do
57. Student's failure to use proper English
58. Avoiding some of the calls on my time and energy that do not significantly increase my professional contributions
59. Teaching students who have not been prepared adequately by the teachers before me
60. Knowing and doing what administrative officers expect and at the same time helping them to examine their expectations
61. How to constantly change curricular practices to adjust to the latest ideas and research findings
62. Students who consistently add and drop classes
63. Inability of some students to learn, and the fact that they retard or slow down the more intelligent ones in some instances
64. Lack of professional attitude on the part of other teachers
65. Growing even more spontaneously warm and appreciative in response to students
66. Administrators who are more interested in numbers than in quality
67. So many required duties which keep me from "my" work
68. Making student evaluation a meaningful process in terms of their learning
69. Lack of time to do well what I am expected to do

70. Establishing relationships with students which provide for an optimum learning climate
71. Rigidity of some students to the introductions of new methods of teaching
72. Inadequate library facilities
73. Lack of communication and planning among departments and within departments necessary to minimize subject matter duplication and to insure desirable course sequences
74. Learning better ways of helping students perceive themselves as "professionals"
75. Helping superior students to work up to the level of their capacity
76. Putting the subject matter over in a way that students can get the most out of it
77. Teaching students how to read and understand what they have read
78. Obtaining resources to accomplish what I believe is important to accomplish
79. Lack of appreciation of the job of the teacher in our culture
80. Lack of concern of students in developing high standards
81. Continuing to become more genuine and open with students
82. Helping students to see purpose in their work
83. Inability of students to do critical thinking
84. Knowing more about what is required in effective job performance and how I can help students achieve this

APPENDIX D

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY, FORM OS-M-HS
(OTHERS-SELF-MALE-HIGH SCHOOL)

Date:_____ Teacher:_____

Grade:_____ Boy or Girl:_____

School:_____ Age:_____

Subject:_____ Father's Occupation:_____

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY--FORM OS-M-HS

Below are listed some ways that a person may feel or behave toward another person.

Please consider each statement carefully with reference to your present relationship with _____.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in plus (+) or minus (-) marks to stand for the following answers:

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

++ Yes, I feel it is true.

\+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

\- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-- No, I feel it is not true.

--- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____ 1. He respects me.

____ 2. He tries to understand exactly how I see things.

____ 3. He is interested in me only when I am talking about certain things.

____ 4. He tells me things that he does not mean.

____ 5. He disapproves of me.

____ 6. He understands my words but does not know how I feel.

____ 7. Sometimes he is more friendly toward me than he is at other times.

____ 8. What he says to me is never different from what he thinks or feels.

____ 9. He is curious about what makes me act like I do, but not really interested in me as a person.

____10. He is interested in knowing how things seem to me.

____11. His feeling toward me is not due to the way that I am reacting to him.

page 2, OS-M-HS

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

++ Yes, I feel it is true.

+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-- No, I feel it is not true.

--- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____12. He is upset whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.

____13. He likes to see me.

____14. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.

____15. He likes me when I feel certain ways about myself but when I feel other ways he does not like me.

____16. He has feelings about me that he doesn't say anything about and these make it harder for us to get along.

____17. He hardly notices me.

____18. At times he thinks that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I do.

____19. He always seems to feel the same way toward me.

____20. He behaves just the way that he really is when I'm around.

____21. He appreciates me.

____22. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.

____23. He likes me in some ways and dislikes me in others.

____24. At times I think he is not aware of the way he feels about me.

____25. He is friendly and warm towards me.

____26. He understands me.

____27. If I am annoyed with him he becomes annoyed with me.

____28. He pretends that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.

____29. He cares about me.

____30. The way he feels about some of the things I say, or do, keeps him from really understanding me.

page 3, OS-M-HS

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

++ Yes, I feel it is true.

+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

\- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-- No, I feel it is not true.

--- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____31. Whether I am expressing "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no difference to the way he feels about me.

____32. He does not avoid anything that he thinks or feels about me.

____33. He feels that I am dull and uninteresting.

____34. He ignores some of my feelings.

____35. Sometimes he is warm and friendly toward me, at other times cold or disapproving.

____36. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.

____37. He is interested in me.

____38. He appreciates how my experiences feel to me.

____39. Depending on the way he feels, he sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than he does at other times.

____40. He is at ease in our relationship.

____41. He just "puts up" with me.

____42. He tells me what my actions and feelings mean.

____43. His liking or disliking of me is not affected by anything that I tell him about myself.

____44. He is acting a part with me.

____45. He does not really care what becomes of me.

____46. He does not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.

____47. His general feeling toward me varies a lot.

____48. Sometimes I feel that what he says to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.

page 4, OS-M-HS

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

++ Yes, I feel it is true.

+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

\- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-- No, I feel it is not true.

--- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____49. I feel that he really things I am worthwhile.

____50. He responds to me mechanically.

____51. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way he feels about me.

____52. I don't think that he is being honest with himself about the ways he feels toward me.

____53. He dislikes me.

____54. He looks at the things I do from his own point of view.

____55. Sometimes he seems to like me and at other times he doesn't seem to care.

____56. I feel that he is being genuine with me.

____57. He is impatient with me.

____58. He generally sees how I am feeling.

____59. He likes me better when I behave in some ways than he does when I behave in other ways.

____60. Sometimes I can see that he is not comfortable with me, but we go on paying no attention to it.

____61. He feels a deep liking for me.

____62. He understands completely what I say to him.

____63. Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how he feels about me.

____64. He does not try to mislead me about his own thoughts or feelings.

____65. He thinks I'm disagreeable.

____66. He can be fully aware of the feelings that hurt me most without being upset himself.

page 5, OS-M-HS

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

++ Yes, I feel it is true.

+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

\- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-- No, I feel it is not true.

--- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____67. I can be very critical of him or I can like him without it changing his feeling toward me.

____68. What he says gives a false impression of his total reaction to me.

____69. At times he feels contempt for me.

____70. Even when I can't say quite what I mean, he still understands me.

____71. I think that my feeling toward him helps to cause him to feel the way he does toward me.

____72. He tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.